

DESIGN-BUILD FINAL QR DOCUMENT

INTERSTATE 65 INTERCHANGE
AT BUCKNER ROAD IN
SPRING HILL, WILLIAMSON COUNTY - TENNESSEE

CONTRACT NUMBER: DB2001

Form QR#1

Form QR#2

Form QR#3 Revised

Form QR#4

Form QR#5

Form QR#6

Form QR#7

Form QR#8

**THIS FINAL QR DOCUMENT INCLUDING THE COVER SHEET SHALL
BE INCLUDED IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (SEE RFP BOOK 1
SECTION I.)**

(Note: Clarifications and revisions are provided to some previous responses.

Where conflict arises, the responses provided in this form supersede the original Contract Book 1, 2, 3, and any Addendum issued prior to the date an individual QR response was posted. Addenda issued after a posted QR response supersede any prior QR response.)



November 24, 2020

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 08/06/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-1	CB-3; Section 2.0	PlanGrid software is required for this project. Will TDOT please elaborate on what specific activities PlanGrid will be used for?	PlanGrid will be used by the Design-Builder to transmit all submittals and RFIs to the Department and by the Department to transmit responses.
1-2	CB-3; Section 3.5	Contract book 3 states "The analysis, design, and construction of all components of the stormwater management system shall address the interim conditions during construction of the Project and the final design." Please provide the criteria (storm frequency) that must be maintained for the interim condition design.	Where not otherwise instructed by the TDOT Design Guidelines, TDOT Drainage Manual, TDOT Standard Drawings, TDOT Design Procedures for Hydraulic Structures 2012, or Permit requirements, the Design-Builder shall design interim open channels to collect and convey without damage, and to confine within any temporary roadside ditches or swales, stormwater flow using a 2-year design frequency. Interim design shall be based on the interim landcover and corresponding Manning coefficients.
1-3	CB-3; Section 1.2; pg 3	RFP states the following Project Goal: "Provide visually pleasing finished product." Please confirm there are no other aesthetic requirements other than bridge aesthetics listed in Section 4.2 and wall aesthetics in Section 4.3?	In addition to Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 listed, the Design-Builder shall refer to any requirements in the Standard Specifications related to the aesthetics or appearance of the project.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-4	CB-3; Section 5.1; pg 26	RFP requires signals to be located at the intersection of Buckner Rd & Lewisburg Pike and at the DDI cross-overs. Please confirm that no signal will be required at the intersection of Buckner Rd & Buckner Ln for this project.	The signal at Buckner Road and Buckner Lane is not included in this project.
1-5	Functional Plans	Please provide Functional Plans and Preliminary Drawing CADD files.	DGN files are available from the Department if the Design-Builder formally requests by submitting a signed CAD Disclaimer form.
1-6	CB-3; Section 3.1; pg 13	Segments 1 and 2 will tie to adjacent projects by the City of Spring Hill. Please provide an update on design status of each of those projects. Additionally, is it anticipated to provide design files of the adjacent projects during this procurement phase?	<p>A City of Spring Hill project is constructing the improvements to the Buckner Road intersection with Buckner Lane. This City project will construct a stub to which Segment 1 will tie as described in Section 3.1. Additional information on this project will be added to the project website at a later date. <u>Any available information can be obtained from the City's website and/or coordination with the City.</u></p> <p><u>https://www.springhilltn.org/606/Buckner-Lane-Widening-Project</u></p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-7	Functional Plans	A 0.02 f/f normal crown cross slope is shown for Buckner Rd across the full travel way width. Section 4.2.2.1 of the AASHTO Geometric Design of Highways and Streets recommends increasing the cross slope on pairs of successive lanes from the first two when the travel way is 3 lanes or greater. Please confirm a 0.02 f/f cross slope is to be used across all lanes of Buckner Rd including the bridge section.	The Design-Builder shall revise the cross slope to conform to the TDOT Design Guidelines.
1-8	Functional Plans	Design note "M" on TDOT standard drawing RD11-TS-4 states, "For concrete ramps use constant cross slope for lanes and shoulders, for asphalt ramps use .04 f/f for tangent shoulders..." however the functional plan typical sections show a 0.04 f/f cross slope along the ramp shoulders. Appendix A of Contract Book 3 indicates the ramps will be paved with concrete and shoulders paved with asphalt. Please confirm a 0.04 f/f cross slope for the ramp shoulders is required.	The cross slope of the shoulders shall conform to note M of RD11-TS-4 for asphalt ramps.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-9	Functional Plans	The functional plans indicate the ramp baseline is to be located at the outside EOP. TDOT standard drawing RD11-TS-4 show the baseline located along the inside EOP, with design note "F" stating, "When the ramp pavement is adjacent to mainline roadway pavement, the profile grade will be located along the mainline edge of pavement" Please confirm the ramp baseline is to be located on the outside EOP.	The ramp baseline can be located at either the inside EOP or outside EOP.
1-10	CB-3; Section 4.2	RFP calls for a 12' future shared use path along the median of the bridge over I-65 with the vertical face of the 51" single slope barrier half wall along each side of the shared use path requiring a dry-stack stone finish. Please confirm that the 12' width requirement is measured from vertical face of barrier to vertical face of barrier, and not face of stone finish.	The 12' dimension shall be measured between the inside vertical faces of the 51" single slope barrier half wall.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 8/19/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-1	RFP Contract Book 1, Section A.2.b; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3	Contract Book 1, Section A.2.b of the RFP states that "the Design-Builder shall not request more than six ATCs". However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "the Design-Builder shall not request more than eight ATCs". What is the maximum number of ATCs that the Design-Builder may request?	The maximum number of ATCs is eight. It will be addressed by a forthcoming addendum.
2-2	RFP Contract Book 1, Section 3.b.3, Pay Item No. 716-99.50	Contract Book 1, Section 3.b.3 of the RFP states that "Snowplowable Pavement Markings to be excluded thru interim design segment of LIC No. 1 under [Pay Item No. 716-99.50]". Does the Department require the use of snowplowable or raised pavement markers on Segment Nos. 2 and 3?	Snowplowable Pavement Markings shall be used where required by Chapter 4 of the TDOT Design Guidelines.
2-3	Special Provision 407IC	Is it the Department's intent to require intelligent compaction on all project segments or only on Interstate 65?	The intent is to be used only on Interstate 65.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-4	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 1.3; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.7	Contract Book 3, Section 1.2 of the RFP states that the signing and striping exhibit provided by the Department is for information only. However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.7 of the RFP states that "signs shall be constructed as shown in the signing and marking roll plots". To what extent will the Department allow deviations from the signing and marking exhibit in the Design-Builder's signing plans?	The Design Builder shall construct the signs as shown in the signing and marking roll plots. No ATC or changes will be accepted during procurement or as Value engineering after the contract is signed.
2-5	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road shall be designed to meet or exceed a rural arterial functional classification. However, the maximum superelevation rate, typical section, and other design elements listed for Buckner Road in the contract book reference an urban arterial functional classification. Shall the Design-Builder design the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road, including the maximum superelevation rate, to meet or exceed a rural arterial or urban arterial functional classification?	The Design-Builder shall design for an Urban Arterial classification as noted in Section 3.2. regardless Buckner Road is currently classified as a Rural Arterial.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-6	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road shall be designed to meet or exceed a maximum grade of 4%. However, the Department's design standards allow for a maximum grade of 6% for rural arterial roadways and 7% for urban arterial roadways. Is it the Department's intent to restrict the maximum grade on Buckner Road to 4% or to allow the maximum grade listed in the design standards?	It is the Department's intent to restrict the maximum grade on Buckner Road to 4%.
2-7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for the diverging diamond interchange crossovers shall be designed to meet or exceed a design speed of 25 miles per hour and lane widths of 15'. What are the limits of the crossovers?	The crossover is defined from the PC of the first curve at the western approach to the PT of the last curve at the eastern approach.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-8	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3; Functional Plans, Sheet 2	The "Cut Section Ditch Detail" in the functional plans does not include a 1–2' buffer between the back of sidewalk/multi-use path and the top of the foreslope that appears on some of the Buckner Road typical sections. Additionally, Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "grass strips (15' on the left and 11' on the right looking forward on survey) shall be provided", which does not include or reference the 1–2' buffer. However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "no ATC will be considered that [...] proposes the elimination of or reduction in width of the grass strips", which also does not include or reference the 1–2' buffer. Is it the Department's intent to include this buffer in the typical sections? If so, does the Department consider it to be part of the grass strips?	The Design-Builder shall design in accordance with standard drawing MM-TS-2. The grass strip identified on the drawing (dimension "D") shall be 5'. The resulting buffer (dimension "C") would be 7.75'. The 11' and 15' grass strips referenced in Section 3.2 refer to the distance from the back of curb to the back edge of the future sidewalk or multi-use path. Sheet 2 of the Functional Plans will be revised.
2-9	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.9	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "grass strips and side slopes [for Buckner Road] shall be sodded". However, Contract Book 3, Section 9.9 of the RFP states that "sod or seed and mulch shall be used for permanent stabilization". Is it the Department's intent to allow seeding and mulching throughout the project, only outside the grass strips and side slopes on the proposed Buckner Road, or not at all?	This will be addressed in a forthcoming Addendum

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-10	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "The typical section shall include Type 6-33 curb and gutter on each side". Is it the Department's intent for the Design-Builder to use standard detached 6" concrete curb for the raised grass median?	Design-Builder shall use 6" Sloping Detached Concrete Curb as shown on standard drawing RP-SC-1.
2-11	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "The typical section shall include Type 6-33 curb and gutter on each side". Will the Department allow the use of standard 6-30 curb and gutter?	6" Sloping curb (Type 6-33) shall be used per note 2 of standard drawing RD11-TS-6A
2-12	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Interstate 65 and Ramps"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the length of Bridge No. 1 is to be based on the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65. Shall the horizontal and vertical alignments of the proposed ramps, particularly where they tie into Interstate 65, also be based on this ultimate typical section?	No. TDOT will address this during the future widening project on Interstate 65.
2-13	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Interstate 65 and Ramps"; Preliminary Bridge Layout of Bridge No. 1	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65, on which the [Bridge No. 1] length is to be based, consists of the following: [...] 12' inside shoulders on each side of I-65". However, the preliminary bridge layout of Bridge No. 1 does not provide 12' inside shoulders where Bent No. 1 encroaches on the median. Is it the Department's intent to allow this exception for the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65?	This will not be a design exception for the DB project, but could be a potential design exception for the future widening. The Department's intent is for the Design-Builder to accommodate the width shown in the typical section shown labeled as "future" in the functional plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-14	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Additional Design Requirements"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the "design of intersections must [...] meet ADA requirements for future shared multi-use path", but does not include or reference the proposed sidewalk on the south side of the proposed Buckner Road. Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the RFP additionally describes the construction of a median refuge at the crossover locations. Is it the Department's intent for the Design-Builder to include curb ramps in the construction of this project beyond the median refuges? What accommodations, if any, does the Department expect for the future sidewalk on the south side of the proposed Buckner Road?	Design-Builder's design shall meet ADA requirements for future sidewalk as well. The only curb ramps included in this project are at the median refuge.
2-15	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3	Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "deviations from the Functional Plans horizontal alignment (greater than 10.0 feet) will require an ATC with Department approval". Will the Department allow deviation from the functional plans' vertical alignment greater than ten feet without an approved ATC?	Changes in the vertical alignment of the Functional Plans does not require an ATC unless it causes work to occur outside the environmental technical study area or otherwise violates the RFP.
2-16	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3; Functional Plans Sheet 3B	Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "no ATC will be considered that [...] places the eastern crossover in such a manner that access to Tract 18 is lost". However, Tract 18 has been subdivided since development of the RFP and functional plans in such a manner that the proposed Buckner Road cannot provide access to all lots. What is the Department's intent regarding approval of ATCs involving the eastern crossover or other areas of the project given the subdivision of Tract 18?	Access to the subdivided tracts will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-17	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.7; Proposed Signing and Striping Exhibit	Contract Book 3, Section 3.7 of the RFP states that "signs shall be constructed as shown in the Signing and Marking Roll Plots" and that "the Design-Builder shall design the [overhead sign] structure to support signs across the entire length of the travel way". However, the proposed signing and striping exhibit shows overhead sign structures on Buckner Road extending only to the median. Additionally, the lateral locations of the sign anchor bases are located on proposed side slopes. Is it the Department's intent to allow overhead sign structures to extend only to the median, as shown in the proposed signing and striping exhibit, or to have them extend across the entire length of the traveled way? What does the Department require regarding protection of sign anchor bases?	<p>The Design-Builder's structural design shall be done assuming that applicable sign loadings are placed along the full length of the travel way beneath the structure. See Chapter 14 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual.</p> <p>Supports in the median are allowed as long as no other condition in the RFP is violated and they are properly protected or outside the clear zone.</p> <p>All overhead support structures in the clear zone shall be protected as shown on standard drawing S-PL-1.</p>
2-18	Functional Plans, Sheets 2 to 2A	Several of the Buckner Road typical sections in the functional plans include a note that reads: "3:1 slopes or flatter are desirable. 2:1 slopes are applicable in areas where [...] cost warrants a steeper than 3:1 slope". The delivery method of this project will result in 2:1 slopes being warranted by cost across all areas to which these typical sections are applicable. Is it the Department's intent to allow the use of 2:1 slopes in these areas?	<p>It is the intent that 3:1 slopes be used to limit the amount of guardrail installed along Buckner Road. The use of 2:1 slopes should be used only to limit impacts to environmental features or if needed to stay within the current environmental study area.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-19	Functional Plans, Sheets 2 to 2A1	The typical section for the proposed Buckner Road bridge over Interstate 65 features a 2' separation between the edge of traveled way and the proposed bridge parapet. However, the typical sections for the remainder of the proposed Buckner Road feature a 2'-9" separation between the edge of traveled way and the curb face. Is it the Department's intent for these distances to be different? If so, how does the Department require the transition between them at the bridge ends to occur?	The bridge parapet will transition on the wingpost as shown on standard drawing STD-1-1SS. The shape of the approaching roadway curb shall transition for a distance not to exceed 5' as needed to ensure a consistent flow line.
2-20	Functional Plans, Sheets 3, 4A-14A	The functional plans do not include driveways or other accommodations for access along the proposed Buckner Road. How does the Department require access to be provided to tracts adjacent to the proposed Buckner Road, if at all?	Field entrances will be required. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
2-21	CB-3; Section 5.2; pg 27	RFP states, "The area of the interchange is defined as follows...Interstate 65 northbound and southbound lanes from northern ramp junctions to the southern ramp junctions." Please clarify if roadway lighting is required along the I-65 ramp acceleration/deceleration lanes and tapers.	Transition lighting will be required beyond the limits defined in Section 5.2 in accordance with the TDOT Traffic Design Manual along the ramps/auxiliary lanes and Buckner Road. The RFP will be updated to reflect this change.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-22	CB-3; Section 3.7; pg 21	RFP states, "Overhead cantilever signs will not be allowed." The Conceptual Signing Plan shown in the IAR appears to reflect signing layout requirements as per MUTCD Figure 2E-12 which depicts a cantilever exit arrow sign at the gore, not the overhead truss span structure required per the RFP, and depicted in the Signing and Striping Exhibit. Please confirm that overhead cantilever signs will not be allowed.	Overhead cantilever signs are not allowed.
2-23	CB-3; Section 5.1	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 5.1 states, "The Design-Builder shall coordinate the signals at the interchange using a fiber optic connection." Please confirm that fiber optic cable is required to coordinate the signals at the crossovers of the Diverging Diamond Interchange only, and installing fiber optic cable and coordinating the signal at Lewisburg Pike or future signal at Buckner Lane to the DDI signals is not required in this contract.	The fiber optic connection is only required to coordinate the crossover signals.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-24	Functional Plans	The R.O.W. Acquisition Table, shown on Sheet 3F, separates the "Area to be Acquired" and the "Easements" into the 3 project segments: LIC. No. 1, Interchange, LIC. No. 2. If R.O.W to be acquired from one property tract is split between 2 or more project segments, will this require a separate R.O.W. acquisition process to be completed for that tract in the applicable project segments?	Yes, it requires a separate R.O.W. acquisition process to be completed for that tract in the applicable project segments.
2-25	Functional Plans	The Property Map shown on sheet 3C depicts Tract 31 is within the proposed R.O.W. for this project. However, this tract has been struck through on the R.O.W. Acquisition Table. Please confirm a portion of Tract 31 property is necessary to be acquired, and it was erroneously struck through on the R.O.W. Acquisition Table.	Acquisition on Tract 31 is necessary for the Functional Plans design. This will be corrected in an upcoming addendum was addressed in revised <u>functional plans</u>.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-26	CB-3; Section 4.3	The first paragraph under section 4.3 states "the exposed face of all retaining walls (excluding the retaining walls at the Interstate 65 Bridge) shall receive an ashlar stone finish approved by the Department". The second paragraph states "For cast-in-place concrete retaining walls (excluding the retaining walls at the Interstate 65 bridge), all exposed surfaces shall receive an applied texture coated finish of Mountain Grey". Is the Design-Builder to assume that all exposed concrete retaining walls, whether Cast-in-place or other method (MSE), should have an Ashlar Stone pattern and texture coated with the Mountain Grey?	Yes, for all walls excluding any walls along Interstate 65 which shall be finished per Section 4.2 of the RFP.
2-27	Proprietary Item Request	The City of Spring Hill is requesting specific street light fixtures and poles to be used on all lighting projects within the City. Please clarify if these proprietary lighting items are to be used along the proposed interchange ramps and I-65 auxiliary lanes.	The poles and light fixtures provided are to be used along Buckner Road. Additional information will be provided in an upcoming addendum to clarify what poles and fixtures can be used on the ramps and auxiliary lanes.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-28	CB-3, Section 3.5	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3.5 states, "The Design-Builder shall...adhere to the latest edition of the TDOT Drainage Manual." Section 8.04 of the TDOT Drainage Manual states, "The need for permanent stormwater storage should be considered for any project which affects an area of one or more acres." If a pre-construction vs post-construction stormwater analysis results in the need for additional retention or storage, should the Design-Builder assume that storage facilities must be located on project ROW or Permanent Drainage Easement?	All drainage for the project shall be designed inside the proposed ROW or in a drainage easement.
2-29	Buckner Interchange NEPA approved Document	Page 19 of the Buckner Interchange NEPA approved documents states, "...final noise abatement decisions will be made during the final design process." The document does not require noise abatement in the functional plans based on the noise analysis. Will any modification to the horizontal or vertical alignments warrant a noise model reanalysis to determine potential abatement.	The Design-Builder shall assess the effects on proposed design changes to the noise analysis that was included in the NEPA document. If the Design-Builder's analysis conclude that noise abatement measures are required, then it shall be completed by the Design-Builder at his expense.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-30	CB-3; Section 3.2; pg 15	RFP states, "Grass strips (15' on the left and 11' on the right looking forward on survey) shall be provided." These grass strips are to accommodate a future multi-use path as per the Functional Plans. Please clarify if these future impervious multi-use paths are to be accounted for in the drainage analysis or should the analysis only account for a pervious grass strip.	The Design-Builder's drainage design shall include these areas as impervious.
2-31	CB-3; Section 5.2; pg 27	RFP states "All Lighting shall be 4000k LED lighting." However, on pages 1 and 2 from the Proprietary Item Request document the Holophane High Mast LED III series lighting fixture with Color Temperature of 3,000K. Can TDOT please clarify what the Color Temperature should be for the High Mast LED fixture?	Lighting shall be 4000k LED. The proprietary item list will be updated under a future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-32	Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements, Subsection <i>DDI Traffic Operations Design Requirements</i>	Reviewing the language in the RFP for the VISSIM model, it appears the primary question would be what exactly is the study area required for the model? Does the VISSIM template file establish the study area? For example, are the design build teams required to do the model for just the interchange and Buckner Road, or do they do the model from I-840 down to Saturn Parkway?	The area to be included in the model is that which is directly impacted by the proposed improvements, which includes all proposed ramp merge and diverge points along I-65, the I-65 mainline within the proposed interchange limits, the proposed ramp intersections with Buckner Road, and proposed Buckner Road including the intersection at Lewisburg Pike. It does not need to include adjacent interchanges along I-65. Traffic turning movements for the study should be obtained from the Reference Materials on the project web site. See <u>QR6-8</u>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 08/23/2020

Revised: 09/02/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-1	Book 3 1.1 Project Description pg. 1	To provide consistency across all price proposals, will TDOT define what guardrail within the project limits is considered “substandard”?	Any existing guardrail present within the project limits that does not meet Std. Dwg. S-GR31-1 and any associated standard drawings for connections and terminals shall be replaced to meet current standards. Guardrail replacement quantity is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
3-2	Book 3, 1.3 Provided Materials pg. 4	Are soil and rock samples that were collected for the geotechnical report available for visual inspection?	Rock samples are available. Design-Builder shall contact TDOT Geotechnical section to arrange a time to view the samples.
3-3	Book 3, 3.1 General pg. 13	What is the design and construction schedule(s) for the adjacent project(s) along Bucker Lane widening?	Anticipated schedule will be posted to the project website at a later time<u>Any available information can be obtained from the City’s website and/or coordination with the City.</u> <u>https://www.springhilltn.org/606/Buckner-Lane-Widening-Project</u>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-4	Book 3, 3.2 Design Requirements pg. 18	Per the roadway scope of work, the design build teams must provide for future construction of cross walks and meet ADA requirements for future shared multi-use path. Does the requirement also apply to the signals scope of work? For example, are the design build teams required to install underground infrastructure under this project for future pedestrian phasing.	Yes. The Design-Builder shall design for future ADA accommodations and provide necessary conduit to allow for connection of these appurtenances in the future.
3-5	BK 3, 3.5 Drainage pg. 20	Will box culverts inspection reports be made available to the Design Builder? Will typical repair details be provided? Will this be a cost-plus item or required repairs be determined by TDOT for consistency across all price proposals for any drainage conveyance structure?	The Department will provide inspection reports if they are available. Typical repair details will be provided on the project website. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the repair quantities and include it in their price proposal.
3-6	BK 3, 4.1 Bridge Design Requirements Pg. 23	Are there any exceptions to exceed the 10,000 psi concrete limits for prestressed concrete beams?	Prestressed beam strength shall not exceed 10,000 psi.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-7	BK 3, 4.1 Bridge Design Requirements Pg. 24	Is AASHTOWare BrR required for the load rating or can we provide the load rating in other software? If there are no exceptions to AASHTOWare BrR, does the design-build team have any options to get a copy of the software via TDOT or at the DOT pricing?	The Design-Builder may use either AASHTOWare BrR or CSI Bridge. The Design-Builder shall contact AASHTOWare to inquire about pricing options for BrR.
3-8	BK 3, 4.1 Bridge Design Requirements (pg. 24) and Bridge No. 1 Preliminary Layout drawing	Will parapet deck drains be allowed to be located over current non-roadway areas of I-65?	Parapet deck drains shall not discharge onto current or future lanes or shoulders of Interstate 65.
3-9	BK 3, 4.2 Buckner Road over Interstate 65 Bridge Aesthetics (pg. 24) and Bridge No. 1 Preliminary Superstructure drawing	Referring to typical section showing dry stacked stone form liner at the columns, does the bottom edge coincide with the top of the future median barrier wall?	The formliner shall extend 1' below the Design-Builder's proposed ground line at the centerline of Interstate 65.
3-10	Book 3, 5.1 Traffic Signals pg. 27	Who will be responsible for the cost associated with providing power to the proposed signal locations?	Cost will not be included in the Design-Builder's bid.
3-11	Book 3, 5.2 Lighting pg. 27	Will TDOT secure maintenance agreements for the interchange lighting?	Yes, this agreement will be between TDOT and the City of Spring Hill.
3-12	Book 3, 5.2 Lighting pg. 27	Can TDOT provide information concerning power source options for the interchange?	Per Section 5.0 of the RFP, the Design-Builder shall coordinate with the City and/or MTEMC to determine electric feed points.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-13	Book 3, 5.2 Lighting pg. 27	Will project use standard TDOT poles (MH, arm, etc.) for offset lights on interstate? Local electric utility (MTEMC) typical power pole is 30'.	Offset lighting on ramps and interstate shall be designed per TDOT standards. This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.
3-14	Book 3, 7.0 ROW Scope of Work, Page 31	ROW: Will TDOT allow a pre-approved threshold for administrative settlements?	No. Each administrative settlement has to be justified/supported.
3-15	Book 3, 7.0 ROW Scope of Work, Page 31	Is there a limit to the amount and/or quantity of checks to be issued by the department per day?	There is no limit to quantity of checks issued.
3-16	Book 3, 11.2 Temporary Lane/Road Closures pg. 57	Per the RFP, rolling road blocks will be allowed for the operations specified in SP108B. Does this also include bridge girder and overhead sign erection over I-65?	Rolling road blocks may be used for erection of bridge girders and overhead signs.
3-17	Book 3, Appendix A pg. 63	Please provide the calculations used to develop the provided pavement designs.	These calculations will not be provided. The RFP pavement sections shall be used.
3-18	Functional Plans sheet 15A (NB exit ramp) and sheet 17A (SB exit ramp)	Will taper type ramps be required at the 2 lane I-65 exits? If so will plans be revised to extend limits of I-65 construction? See 2018 AASHTO Green Book Fig 10-77	Taper type ramps are required. Revised Functional plans will be posted to the project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-19	Functional Plans sheet 18A (NB entrance ramp)	Does the 700' gap-length tangent (beyond the termination of the second ramp) of the northbound on-ramp meet AASHTO Section 10.9.6.6.5 requirements? See 2018	Functional plans will be revised to update the gap-length to 900'.
3-20	Functional Plans sheet 2A5 and Bridge No. 1 Preliminary Bridge Layout drawing	Is the 72'-0" dimension on the future I-65 typical sections correct from centerline to face of wall?	The 72' dimension is measured from the centerline of Interstate 65 to the top of the future barrier wall. Sheet 2A5 of the Functional Plans will be revised.
3-21	Roadway plans sheet 2A1	Since no TDOT standard drawing exists for the barrier wall taper detail shown, will TDOT be providing crash testing and design details? Will TDOT accept a standard drawing from another state DOT?	This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-22	Functional Plans sheet 2A5 and Bridge No. 1 Preliminary Bridge Layout drawing	Will turning retaining wall wingwalls along the roadway alignment be allowed at the bridge ends?	This will be allowed.
3-23	Bridge No. 1 Preliminary Superstructure drawing	Will a flat bottom Bent cap configuration be allowed?	The bent cap shall have a hammerhead appearance as stated in Section 4.2 of the RFP.
3-24	Book 3; Section 1.3	Please provide the 2040-year traffic volumes, or indicate what traffic volumes are to be used for the signal timing and VISSIM model.	Additional traffic information has been posted to the project website.
3-25	Book 3; Section 5.1	Please indicate whether right-turn on red is required or optional (based on sight distance) at each of the interchanges signalized intersections.	Right turn on red for Ramps A and D shall be prohibited.
3-26	Book 3; Section 3.5	Please identify if there are any modifications to the design requirements for the cut-ditch behind the proposed sidewalk and multi-use path.	In cut sections, the Design-Builder shall provide a ditch such that water does not convey across the multi-use path from the cut slopes.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-27	Book 3; Section 3.5	Please define what is meant by the phrase “reducing hydraulic capacity”. Does this include a check of water surface elevation upstream of the culvert or will it solely be a check of the pipe capacity utilizing the manning’s equation?	For an existing pipe requiring a liner, the Design-Builder shall check the existing conditions and ensure that the selected liner will maintain or improve existing conditions (flow, backwater, velocity, headwater elevation, etc.). The Design-Builder shall make any necessary improvements to the inlet or outlet for the calculated velocities.
3-28	Book 3; Section 3.5	What type of culvert modeling will be required for culverts that have a 50-yr design event storm less than 500CFS?	Refer to Section 6.06 of the TDOT Drainage Manual for acceptable software.
3-29	Book 3; Section 4.2	Please identify the minimum reveal for the proposed form liner finishes. Is this width to be incorporated into the barrier rail to ensure adequate cover over the rebar?	The form liner shall have a minimum relief of 1.25”. The provided cover shall account for the maximum relief of the selected form liner.
3-30	Book 3; Section 4.2	Referring to the above question, if the barrier rail width was increased, can the shared-use path width or travel lane width be reduced?	The lane widths and shared-use path width shall not be reduced from what is shown in the RFP and Functional Plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-31	Book 3; Section 6.0	If phosphatic soils are encountered along the proposed corridor, can these be remediated and re-used as roadway fill?	The department recommends that excavations containing phosphatic material that do not meet all TDOT requirements for fill material shall be wasted off site. If encountered at the proposed subgrade elevation, the Department recommends undercut and replacement.
3-32	Book 3; Section 6.0	Does TDOT have a preferred remediation method if phosphatic soils are encountered (i.e. soil-cement)?	See QR3-31.
3-33	Book 3; Section 8.0 and Book 2; General Contract Provisions, Defined Terms and General Scope of Work	Please clarify if the department or the design builder will be performing utility coordination.	TDOT will perform utility coordination for the project. See utility scope of work in Book 3, Section 8. The Design-Builder will provide utility coordination for relocations during construction.
3-34	Book 3; Section 3.2	Please identify the limits of the study network for the requested VISSIM model.	<u>See QR2-32.</u>See QR6-8

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-35	Book 3; Section 3.2	In what format will the VISSIM model information need to be provided (spreadsheet, memo, model, etc..)?	The Design-Builder shall provide the results relevant to the measurements of effectiveness required by the RFP in a clear format. VISSIM reports or a tabular format is acceptable. The VISSIM model file should also be included in this submittal. See QR6-8
3-36	Book 3; Section 11.1	Please provide any available information regarding existing pavement depths on I-65 shoulders and what pavement design will be needed for temporary traffic control if shoulders are utilized.	The Department is working to obtain this information. This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum. There is no information available from the Department for existing pavement of the inside shoulder of I-65. All available information has been provided on the project website in reference materials. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design any temporary pavement. See QR8-26.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

3-37	Book 3; Section 4.1	<p>Memorandum 7 of the TDOT Design Procedures for Hydraulic Structures 2012, states, "Bridge Deck Drains and End of Bridge Drains shall be spaced so that no more than the shoulder area would be flooded during the design storm where possible. At locations with a Design Speed of less than 45 mile/h and minimum shoulder widths of 2 to 4 feet, it may be acceptable to allow limited spread into the lane adjacent to the shoulder. In no case will the usable roadway width in the inundated lane be reduced to less than 6 feet." Please verify that since the roadway design speed is 45 mile/h that the spread within the bridge length must be limited to the shoulder area.</p>	<p>For the bridge over Interstate 65, the spread shall be limited to the shoulder plus three feet of the adjacent lane. For all other bridges, the spread shall be limited to the shoulder.</p>
------	---------------------	--	--

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-38	Book 3; Section 1.2	After the slight delay in the RFP release, will TDOT consider a revision to the final completion date?	Not at this time. The final completion date is September 30, 2023 which is more than 980 days from the anticipated NTP for this contract.
3-39	CB-3; Section 4.2; pg 24	RFP calls for 51" single slope barrier half walls along the median 12' shared use path. However, TDOT Standard Drawing S-SSMB series do not show an application of this wall as freestanding in a roadway sections (i.e. not along face of retaining wall or bridge pier). Please clarify if this barrier per the Standard Drawing is to be used for this application, or if this will require a unique or special barrier design.	<u>The pedestrian barriers were addressed in Addendum 2 and detail information was added to the project website. See QR3-21.</u>
3-40	CB-3; Section 3.3; pg 19 / Functional Plan Typical Sections	The Typical Sections in the Functional Plans indicate 5' "Grass Strip" on either side of Buckner Road, and 15' "Grass" on the right of the road and 11' "Grass" on the left. RFP Section 3.3 states that no ATC will be considered that eliminates or reduces the width of the grass strips. Are the "Grass Strips" considered to be the 5' width labeled "Grass Strips" in the Typical Sections, or the 11' and 15' overall widths labeled "Grass?"	The left side of Buckner Road shall include a 15' grass strip under this project to accommodate a future 5' grass strip with a 10' multi-use path. The right side of Buckner Road shall include an 11' grass strip under this project to accommodate a future 5' grass strip with a 6' sidewalk. No ATC will be considered that reduces these dimensions or eliminates any of these areas.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Response
3-41	CB-3; Section 3.7; pg 15	Please provide minimum vertical clearance requirements for overhead sign structures.	Overhead sign structures shall provide a minimum vertical clearance of not less than 19'-6" to the sign, light fixture, sign bridge, or walkway over the entire width of the pavement and shoulders.
3-42	CB-3; Section 3.2; pg 16	Please confirm that all ramps will require a 6' inside (4' paved) and 12' outside (10' paved) shoulder, including the 3-lane ramps.	Shoulder widths shall be 6' inside (4' paved) and 12' outside (10' paved) as shown on Standard Drawing RD11-TS-4 including three lane ramps.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 09/11/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-1	Proprietary Item Request	Pages 1 and 2 from the Lighting Proprietary Item Request document the Holophane High Mast LED III series lighting fixture with Color Temperature of 3,000K is specified. According to QR response 2-31, all lighting shall be 4000k LED lighting, which is anticipated to be updated when the proprietary item list will be updated under a future addendum. However, Holophane has recently released their LED High Mast version 4 fixture with improved optics and lumen output. Will the Series 3 still be required, or will TDOT be updating the requirement to include the new Series 4?	Use of the Series 3 fixtures is acceptable.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-2	CB-3; Section 5.0 Traffic Signals and Lighting Scope of Work, and Section 5.2 Lighting	Contract Book 3, section 5.0 states, "The Design-Builder shall install a minimum of three 2" conduits in the parapets on each side of the bridge over Interstate 65. Two of these conduits on each side are spares for future use by the City and shall not be used by the Design-Builder." Section 5.2 of the RFP states, "All wiring shall be concealed underground in 2-inch schedule 40 PVC rigid conduit. The conduit shall be installed a minimum depth of 26 inches as measured from finished subgrade." Please clarify that the conduits over the bridge can be encased in parapet?	The conduits across any bridges along Buckner Road shall be encased in the parapets.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-3	CB 3; Section 3.2; pg 14	In section 3.2 of Contract Book 3 the design speed of the crossovers is specified as 25 mph, however sheet 2B3 of the functional plans show a 20-mph design speed. Please clarify which design speed is correct.	The crossovers shall be designed to 25mph. Criteria in Contract Book 3 controls.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-4	CB-3; Section 3.2; pg 15	RFP requires a 17'-0" minimum vertical clearance for the bridge over I-65. Please confirm an additional 0'-6" of vertical clearance does not have to be provided as stated in TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines Chapter 2 Section 102.05.	The 17'-0" includes the 6" allowance referenced in Section 2-102.05 of the Design Guidelines.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-5	Addendum #1 Section 3.2; Functional Plans	Addendum #1, Section 3.2 states "The use of 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road should be used based on Case II slopes as applicable within the interchange access control and only by approved Alternate Technical Concept along Buckner Road." However, the functional plans depict sections of the alignment that are designed with 2:1 slopes, such as stations 207+00 to 209+50 LT along Buckner Road as well as Sheet 2A4 depicting Typical Sections for Private Drive to Field or Residential Property. Please confirm that the Design-Builder must submit an ATC for these 2:1 slopes shown in the functional plans.	<p>The intent is to minimize 2:1 slopes and the associated use of guardrail along Buckner Road Extension. The use of 2:1 slopes at the locations where 2:1 slopes are used in the Functional Plans does not require an ATC. If the Design-Builder wishes to utilize 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road beyond is the limits of 2:1 slopes shown in the functional plans, it must be with an approved ATC. This criteria does not apply to private drives.</p> <p>Note, it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder's geotechnical investigation to confirm that the use of all side slopes proposed are acceptable, including those shown in the Functional Plans, during the definitive design phase.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-6	CB-3; Section 3.5; Appendix A Pavement Design	RFP Contact Book 3 Section 3.3 states, “No ATC will be considered that changes the pavement design from that shown in Appendix A.” RFP Contract Book 3 Appendix A specifies underdrain to be installed only on I-65 and ramps. Please confirm that the design builder shall only install underdrain in the areas prescribed in the RFP Appendix A pavement design, or if the Design-Builder's geotechnical analysis shall be used to determine the need for underdrain along roadways.	The Design-Builder shall only install underdrain in the areas prescribed in the RFP Appendix A.
4-7	Preliminary Plans, Sheet 2A2	<p>The Typical Sections of the Preliminary Plans, specifically Sheet 2A2 provides note E “See Standard Drawing S-CZ-1 for Clear Zone Criteria...”</p> <p>Please clarify if Buckner Rd is classified as a low speed urban road related to clear zone requirements shown on TDOT Standard Drawing S-CZ-1.</p>	Buckner Road is not a low speed urban road.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-8	CB 3; Sections 3.2; pg 14; Functional Plans pg 23	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 states the design speed for ramp proper and ramp entrances is 60 mph. The sag vertical curve on Ramp C between stations 705+25.00 to 713+55 of the functional plans has a K value of 130, which does not meet the minimum for 60 mph. Please confirm if the Ramp C vertical alignment must meet the minimum 60 mph K Value.	The Design-Builder shall adjust the profile to meet a 60mph K value for Ramp C. Criteria in Contract Book 3 controls.
4-9	CB 3; Section 7.0 Right-of-Way; TDOT ROW Procedures Manual, Chapter VIII, Part III, Section XIV-D	Per the Department's Right-of-Way Manual, Chapter VIII, Part III, Section XIV-D, "Rights-of-Entry may be procured prior to the Initiation of Negotiations only with the prior written approval of the Right-of-Way Division Director or designee." Will the Department consider allowing this for this Project, or will all Design-Builders need to assume that no Right-of-Entry can be provided until completion of the full ROW process?	The Department is investigating this issue. It will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-10	CB-3, Section 3.2 Page 17 & Department Response to QR2-32	Per the Department's response to QR2-32, the traffic model is to include the intersection of Buckner Rd & Lewisburg Pike. Initial modeling is resulting in average level of service of F. Is there a minimum LOS that the Department will require at this intersection, and if so is it the responsibility of the Design-Builder to improve the intersection (add widening, turning lanes, additional storage, etc.) beyond what is shown in the Functional Plans and include that in their bid/proposal?	The intersection should be designed and constructed with the layout as depicted in the Functional Plans. The intersection should be removed from the Vissim Model for analysis of the proposed interchange. QR2-32 response will be revised.
4-11	QR1-6	Please provide additional information on the City's Buckner Lane improvements project.	Additional information on the Buckner Lane improvements can be found on the City of Spring Hill website at: https://www.springhilltn.org/606/Buckner-Lane-Widening-Project

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-12	RFP Book 3, Section 9	How is ROW to be handled for mitigation purposes?	The Design Builder is responsible for all mitigation cost which includes land acquisition for mitigation. The Design builder must follow the Uniform Act and the ROW Procedures Manual when acquiring mitigation sites.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 09/24/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-1	Book 3, Section 3.7, and Signing and Marking Roll Plots	Reference QR#2-22; Are the signs (with signal ahead flashers) along Lewisburg Pike considered mast arms or cantilever signs? Will these use the same mast arms as the signals?	The referenced signs with the flashers on Lewisburg Pike shall be placed on mast arms in advance of the signal. Mast arms shall be similar to those used for the signals.
5-2	Book 3, Section 3.2	How shall the grass median be stabilized? Do you want to specify sod or can it also be seeded with mulch?	Median shall be stabilized with sod.
5-3	Book 3, Section 3.5	Reference to QR#3-28, are there any known special circumstances on the project that required specific hydraulic analysis software packages to be utilized?	There are no known special circumstances of which the Department is aware that would supersede the TDOT Drainage Manual.
5-4	Book 3, Section 3.5 and Functional Plans	The existing 5x6 box culvert under I-65 to be extended is not a standard shape in the TDOT standard drawings. Is the size listed correctly? If so, will this be a special design element?	The Design-Builder shall confirm the size of any structures within the project limits. If non-standard sizes are encountered, the Design-Builder is responsible for the design and cost associated with that design for any special designs that meet the concurrence of the department.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-5	Book 3, Section 3.7, and Signing and Marking Roll Plots	If signs on the functional plan layout extend beyond the ETSA boundary, will this require a NEPA reevaluation?	The Department is working to clear the areas where signs are located outside of the current ETSA.
5-6	Book 3, Section 5.0	Where will the 4 spare 2" conduits connect on the Buckner Ln. approach? Does the City have a standard for junction/pull box placement? Is there a specific area identified for these facilities? MTEMC has stated that their requirement is 500ft between pull boxes	This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.
5-7	BK 3, Section 3.5- Drainage	The project is in a largely rural area with no current residential/ commercial development upstream. Are we to size the drainage structures based on current drainage area conditions and assume future upstream developments will employ on-site detention to match predevelopment flow?	Drainage structures should be designed based on current conditions. Future development will be required to provide its own on-site detention.
5-8	BK 3, Section 3.5- Drainage and Functional Plans sheets 7 and 8	Will the existing 10x7 box culvert under I-65 at STA 535+35 +/- remain in place with only minor repairs and no additional hydraulic conveyance? If so, will the proposed structures up and downstream need to be sized assuming the existing box remains in place or size them as if all structures in line are appropriately sized?	The existing structure referenced will remain with only repairs completed under this contract. The proposed structures up and downstream should be sized assuming the existing box remains.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-9	BK 3, Section 5.2 Lighting Pg. 27	Ramp C Lighting – Please confirm the intention for the lighting at the interchange. Is it to light the entire merge area for the two-lane ramps or until both lanes are merged with I-65?	The lighting on Ramp C shall extend until both lanes are merged with I-65.
5-10	Bk 3, Section 3.2 – Design Requirements, DDI Traffic Operations Design Requirements. Pg. 17	VISSIM – Please provide a list of assumptions for all traffic parameters, signal timing, and driver behaviors for the VISSIM model to provide a consistency baseline for all teams	It is still under review

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-11	Book 3, Section 8.0 Utility Scope of Work Pg. 38 & 39	<p>After a meeting with AT&T regarding the existing fiber optic line along the east side of I-65, we learned they will not begin any work (construction, design, or ROW/Easement procurement) until they have definitive plans from the Design Build project team. After AT&T has these plans, their tentative schedule would take them at least 14 months between easement procurement, design and contractor procurement, and construction before the line has been relocated, which will be more than half of our maximum allowable construction period under the contract. Based upon this information - first – will TDOT provide a timeline to all Design-Build teams for the relocation of the AT&T line for all bidders to use as a basis for our bid proposals? Second, will TDOT extend the project completion time due to the amount of time required by AT&T to complete their relocation work?</p>	<p>It is under review. <u>See Addendum 4, Section 3.2.</u></p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-12	<p>Book 3, section 10 Construction Scope of Work, Pg. 54</p> <p>Book 3, Section 6 Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work Pg. 29</p>	<p>Our team is requesting the Department provide design criteria to evaluate use and/or replacement of phosphatic soil. Based upon the subsurface information provided, phosphatic soils will be present throughout the roadway corridor at or near subgrade in most of the cut sections. The workability and strength of this material can be greatly affected by several factors such as moisture content and the level of phosphate. First, what are the Department's design criteria, to be utilized by the D-B teams, to determine whether phosphatic material is acceptable for use as embankment within the project limits or if the material would need to be disposed of off-site (for example, PI greater than 35; moisture and/or phosphate are in excess of specific limits)? Second, if phosphatic material is encountered at subgrade, what are the Department's design criteria to determine if the material needs to be undercut (for example, PI greater than 20)? Third, if the Department's undercut requirement criteria are met, what are the Department's design criteria for the depth of undercut and material to be used to replace the phosphatic material (for example, undercut subgrade 3 feet and replace with graded solid rock)?</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory materials which cannot be properly compacted may be undercut and replaced by materials identified in Section 203.02.B of the Standard Specifications. Phosphatic soils may be undercut and replaced or treated to achieve proper compaction. The geotechnical report and investigation is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to determine the cost of any undercutting related to the project and incorporate the cost into the price bid for the work.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-13	Book 1, Section 5 Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines, as amended in Addendum #1. Pg. 7	TDOT has indicated Addendum #2 to the RFP and Functional Plans are forthcoming. As Addendum #2 has not been received as of 9/10/2020, we would request that TDOT extend the ATC and Initial DDI Design, Lighting, and Right-Of-Way Acquisition (Exhibit) due dates to allow for review and potential submittal of additional questions and/or ATC(s) based on information contained within.	The schedule was revised in Addendum 2 and is being evaluated for any applicable changes.
5-14	Book 1, Section 5 Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines, as amended in Addendum #1. Pg. 7	TDOT has indicated Addendum #2 to the RFP and Functional Plans are forthcoming. As Addendum #2 has not been received as of 9/10/2020, we would request that TDOT extend the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal due date to 12/04/2020 to allow for the incorporation of addendum #2 into our designs and construction program	The schedule was revised in Addendum 2 and is being evaluated for any applicable changes.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-15	Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements. Pg. 15	The RFP indicates a 17'- 0" minimum vertical clearance over the ultimate number of lanes and shoulders of Interstate 65 described in Section 3.2 for the bridge over Interstate 65 is required. Is an additional 6" required for future pavement or does the 17'-0" take this into account.	See QR 4-4.
5-16	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2; Question Request #3-21	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "concrete barriers (51" shall be constructed to allow for a center 12' shared-use path on the bridge over Interstate 65". However, the Department's response to QR #3-21 states that "the Design-Builder shall submit its proposed barrier wall for the shared use path on the bridge over Interstate 65 as an ATC for approval". As a required portion of the work, this submittal does not fit the requirements of an ATC submittal and creates a situation where rejection of the Design-Builder's ATC would result in a non-responsive bid. Will the Department consider creating a separate submittal for the proposed barrier wall design outside the ATC process?	It is still under review

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-17	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 (Revision #1)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the first revision of the RFP states that "the use of 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road should be used based on Case II slopes as applicable within the interchange access control and only by approved Alternate Technical Concept along Buckner Road". Is it the Department's intent to allow the use of 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road within Segment No. 2, Interstate 65, and all interchange ramps without an approved Alternate Technical Concept?	Any 3:1 slopes in the Functional Plans being proposed to change to 2:1 must be approved through an ATC.
5-18	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 (Revision #2)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the second revision of the RFP states that "The 51" single slope barrier on the bridge over Interstate 65 shall extend off the bridge toward the median refuge. The 51" single slope barrier shall transition to a 6" curb over a distance of fifty (50) feet as it approaches the median refuge ramp". Given the addition of the pedestrian barrier in the second revision of the RFP, is it the Department's intent to remove this requirement?	The details of the pedestrian barrier will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-19	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 (Revision #2)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the second revision of the RFP states that “all proposed guardrail along Buckner Road shall be placed at the location required to accommodate the future sidewalk and multi-use path (see Standard Drawing S-PL-6). Right-of-way shall be notched such that proposed guardrail and terminals are within the proposed right-of-way”. Is it the Department’s intent to require that all proposed guardrail along Buckner Road be placed at the back of the future sidewalk and multi-use path (requiring the notched right-of-way), and not at the back of the proposed curb?	All proposed guardrail shall be placed such that it will be in the location required when the future sidewalk and multi-use path is constructed.
5-20	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.6	Contract Book 3, Section 9.6 of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any and all compensatory mitigation of impacts to environmental features (streams and/or wetlands) for the Project”. Where on-site mitigation of impacts may occur, will the Department allow impacts from one segment to be mitigated in another segment?	This is allowed.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-21	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.7	Contract Book 3, Section 9.7 of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall determine all permits required in order to perform the work”. Will the Department require the Design-Builder to obtain separate permits for Segments No. 1, 2, and 3?	The Design-Builder is not required to separate the permits by project segment.
5-22	Question Request #2-17	The Department's response to QR #2-17 states that "supports in the median are allowed as long as no other condition in the RFP is violated and they are properly protected or outside the clear zone." Is it the Department's intent to require the protection of sign supports in the median within the clear zone on all project segments or only on Interstate 65?	All sign supports within the clear zone on all routes and ramps shall be protected.
5-23	Question Request #2-20	The Department’s response to QR #2-20 states that “field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]”. Will the Department require the Design-Builder to negotiate the placement of field entrances with affected property owners during the right-of-way acquisition phase?	The final row plans shall include a field entrance for each property owner. During negotiations the property owner may request to move this entrance to another location on their property, which is part of the negotiation process. The Design Builder shall evaluate the requested alternative location and ensure that the driveway can be designed to meet all design requirements specified in the RFP. Any cost associated with that Design shall be the Design Builder’s responsibility.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-24	Question Request #2-20	The Department's response to QR #2-20 states that "field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]". Will the Department require the construction of frontage or side roads to access affected properties not adjacent to proposed right-of-way?	It is still under review.
5-25	Question Request #2-20; Functional Plans	The Department's response to QR #2-20 states that "field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]". However, the functional plans do not include median openings along Buckner Road. Will the Department require the Design-Builder to include median openings along Buckner Road, either at the intervals specified in the Department's design standards or to accommodate the field entrances?	Median opening locations will be addressed by a future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-26	CB-3; Appendix A	RFP Contract Book 3 Appendix A provides a full depth pavement buildup for Lewisburg Pike. Cross-sections provided by TDOT indicate widening the road with the full depth pavement buildup shown in Appendix A and leveling of the existing roadway. Please clarify if the intent is to remove the existing pavement and place full depth pavement buildup across the full width of proposed Lewisburg Pike, or if this will be accomplished with leveling, and if so what leveling coarse should the DB be assumed to use.	The full-depth pavement for the widening shall be done with the pavement design of Appendix A. The Design-Builder shall mill 1.25” and overlay the existing pavement with 1.25” ACS (PG70-22) GR “D” Mix. Appendix A will be revised in an upcoming addendum.
5-27	CB-3 Addendum #1; Section 5.0; pg 26	RFP Addendum #1 states, “The two spare 2” conduits shall run for the full length of project along each side of Buckner Road terminating near the signal at Lewisburg Pike.” TDOT specifications require a different pull box spacing depending on if the conduit is conveying electrical wiring for signals, electrical wiring for lighting, or fiber optic lines. Please clarify the future intent of the spare conduits.	This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-28	Book 1, Section E.1.a.1	<p>"Contract Book 1 Section E.1.a.1, states that the proposal responses to RC II through IV shall be limited to the combined maximum total of 75 page count and that all information submitted in RC II through IV will be counted in calculating page count, regardless of format or medium.</p> <p>Please clarify if the following will be counted towards the 75-page count:</p> <p>(1) Half-size plan sheets to be included in RC IV (CB 1, Section D.4.d)</p> <p>(2) CPM Schedule to be included as part of RCIII (per Form RC III and CB 1, Section D.3.b.1)"</p>	<p>Half-sized plan sheets will not be counted against the page count limit, however, the CPM Schedule will count against the page count limit for Response Categories II through IV.</p>
5-29	CB-3 Addendum #2	<p>Addendum #2, Section 5.2 states "The illuminance method shall be used (Values of Average Maintained Minimum, Average/Min., and Max/Min shall be in accordance with Chapter 15 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual)..." The "Max/Min" value is not listed in Chapter 15 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual, however the Veiling Luminance Ratio, LVmax/Lavg is shown in Table 15.3. Please clarify if the Department requires "Max/Min" values, and if so, will the Department please provide those values?</p>	<p>The max/min values shall be 6:1. The Department no longer uses "Veiling" since IES & AASHTO came up with the BUG rating.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-30	CB 3; Section 3.5	<p>Per RFP Section 3.5, The Design-Builder shall embed culverts for aquatic organism passage for all streams in accordance with the requirements of FHWA Hydraulic Engineering Circular (HEC) 26, “Culvert Design for Aquatic Organism Passage”. HEC 26, Section 7.5.3 suggests the recommended embedment depth should be a minimum of 2 feet and then filled with natural substrate materials to match the existing stream elevations. However, TDOT Drainage Manual Section 6.04.1.1.1.3 suggests a 1 foot embedment below the stream bed and then filled with natural substrate materials to match the existing stream elevations. Please confirm whether the DB shall meet the TDOT Drainage Manual or FHWA HEC-26 embedment depth requirements.</p>	<p>Section 6.04.1.1.1.3 of the Drainage Manual does not specifically address aquatic passage. The Department requires the following criteria be met by its designs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The upstream and downstream inverts of the culvert should be buried/embedded to a depth of 20% (box culverts) or 30% (circular culverts) of the culvert height to allow a natural bedload to cover the bottom of the culverts • The width of the base flow culverts should be approximately equal to the average channel width upstream and downstream from the proposed culvert • Natural channel materials should be installed into the new culverts to satisfy the embedment criteria. Materials should be approximately the size and composition of bed materials upstream and downstream of the culverts and should meet the criteria in HEC-26

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-31	Functional Plans	<p>According to the Functional Plan, Property Map Sheet 3B and the R.O.W. Acquisition Table Sheet 3F, indicate Tract 17 as "Loss of Access". Per Present Layout Sheet 15, the proposed cut line and proposed R.O.W. (C.A.) & Fence run directly through the existing structure labeled 2-S-BR. Res., as well as smaller structures in Tract 18. Can the department please indicate the intent with these structures, as it appears that structure demolition will be required in both Tract 17 and 18, in addition to any loss of access in Tract 17.</p>	<p><u>With construction of the access road, there is no longer loss-of-access to consider for Tract 17. In regard to any structure to be removed for the acquisition of ROW, a temporary easement will be required for the removal of the portion of the structure that is beyond the limits of the proposed ROW. Structures on a tract identified as "Loss of Access" shall be demolished and removed. A temporary construction easement will be required to remove any structure outside the proposed ROW. Refer to the TDOT ROW Manual for additional information.</u></p>
5-32	RFP Section 9	<p>Has the City identified any potential stream mitigation sites?</p>	<p>The City completed a Visual Stream Assessment in May of 2020. This document can be viewed at the City webpage below:</p> <p>https://www.springhilltn.org/420/Reports</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 10/14/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-1	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3.2 requires I-65 resurfacing from the southernmost log mile for the beginning of Ramp B or Ramp D auxiliary lane (whichever is furthest south) to the northernmost log mile for the end of Ramp A or Ramp C auxiliary lane (whichever is furthest north). Please clarify if the log mile should be taken at the Design Builders southernmost and northernmost extent of the furthest ramp taper (stations 499+15 and 573+22 if not different than Functional Plans), corresponding to a fractional log mile, or if the Department requires the surfacing to extend past these points to the nearest whole number log mile.	The Design-Builder's mill and overlay limits for NB and SB Interstate 65 do not need to be extended to the next whole number log mile. The limits of the mill and overlay along I-65 should be defined by the extent of the proposed ramp auxiliary lanes/tapers and shoulders constructed adjacent to I-65. Additionally, if any existing pavement or pavement markings are disturbed beyond the limits defined above, the Design-Builder must extend the mill and overlay limits to include those disturbed areas.
6-2	Reference Material, Survey Files, ROW Acquisition Table	Please provide a ROW acquisition table spreadsheet reflecting the most recent tracts per the functional plans dated 9-19-20. Also, please provide this spreadsheet unlocked.	This information is available on the project web site.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-3	Revised Functional Plans dated 9/18/20	Sheet 14A in the revised functional plans dated 9-18-20 depict "Additional Environmental Technical Study Area". Will the Department be responsible to provide the additional environmental study, or will this be the responsibility of the design builder?	The Department is working to obtain environmental clearance of this area. All other changes in environmental impacts shall be the responsibility of the Design-Builder for NEPA re-evaluation, technical study updates or other action as required for environmental clearance.
6-4	Book 3, Section 5.2 (Revision language in Addendum #2 sheet 18 of PDF)	The RFP states that allowable wall pack lighting will be provided on the project website. None can be found at this time 10/7/2020. Without this information, we are presently unable to complete the photometrics for the portion of I-65 between the ramp gores. The under-bridge lighting is a critical component to the overall max/min values associated with the photometrics in this area.	Wall pack lighting is shown in the Proprietary Item Request and Justification for Street Lighting pages 16 thru 19 listed on the project website.
6-5	Functional Plans	As noted in the revised functional plans dated 9/18/2020, will the ETSA boundaries and NEPA document be updated by TDOT? What is the timeline for the NEPA document re-evaluation?	See QR6-3. This clearance is currently anticipated to be provided no later than the date of award of the Design-Build Contract.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-6	Book 3, Section 1.3	Culvert Inspection Reports are listed as material to be provided on the project website. This information is not listed on the website at this time 10/7/2020.	This information has been added to the project website.
6-7	QR4-9	Has the Department determined if Right-of-Entry prior to the Initiation of Negotiations will be allowed?	Right-of-Entry will not be allowed prior to Initiation of Negotiations.
6-8	QR5-10: Bk 3, Section 3.2 – Design Requirements, DDI Traffic Operations Design Requirements. Pg. 17	VISSIM – Please provide a list of assumptions for all traffic parameters, signal timing, and driver behaviors for the VISSIM model to provide a consistency baseline for all teams	The Vissim model requirement has been removed from the RFP.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-9	QR5-11: Book 3, Section 8.0 Utility Scope of Work Pg. 38 & 39	<p>After a meeting with AT&T regarding the existing fiber optic line along the east side of I-65, we learned they will not begin any work (construction, design, or ROW/Easement procurement) until they have definitive plans from the Design Build project team. After AT&T has these plans, their tentative schedule would take them at least 14 months between easement procurement, design and contractor procurement, and construction before the line has been relocated, which will be more than half of our maximum allowable construction period under the contract. Based upon this information - first – will TDOT provide a timeline to all Design-Build teams for the relocation of the AT&T line for all bidders to use as a basis for our bid proposals? Second, will TDOT extend the project completion time due to the amount of time required by AT&T to complete their relocation work?</p>	<p>This has been addressed in Addendum 4.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-10	QR5-16: RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2; Question Request #3-21	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "concrete barriers (51" shall be constructed to allow for a center 12' shared-use path on the bridge over Interstate 65". However, the Department's response to QR #3-21 states that "the Design-Builder shall submit its proposed barrier wall for the shared use path on the bridge over Interstate 65 as an ATC for approval". As a required portion of the work, this submittal does not fit the requirements of an ATC submittal and creates a situation where rejection of the DesignBuilder's ATC would result in a non-responsive bid. Will the Department consider creating a separate submittal for the proposed barrier wall design outside the ATC process?	The pedestrian barriers were addressed in Addendum 2 and detail information will be added to the project website.
6-11	QR5-18: RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 (Revision #2)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the second revision of the RFP states that “The 51” single slope barrier on the bridge over Interstate 65 shall extend off the bridge toward the median refuge. The 51” single slope barrier shall transition to a 6” curb over a distance of fifty (50) feet as it approaches the median refuge ramp”. Given the addition of the pedestrian barrier in the second revision of the RFP, is it the Department’s intent to remove this requirement?	The pedestrian barriers were addressed in Addendum 2 and detail information will be added to the project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-12	QR5-24: Question Request #2-20	The Department's response to QR #2-20 states that "field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]". Will the Department require the construction of frontage or side roads to access affected properties not adjacent to proposed right-of-way?	This has been addressed in Addendum 4.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 10/27/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-1	RFP Contract Book 1, Section 3	Contract Book 1, Section 3 of the RFP states that “a stipulated fee of \$100,000 will be awarded to each eligible Design-Builder on the short-list that provides a responsive bid, but unsuccessful, Proposal”. Will the Department consider increasing this stipend in light of the changes to the scope of the RFP and submittal requirements?	The Department is not considering any increase of the stipend.
7-2	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that “design of intersections must provide for future construction of cross walks and meet ADA requirements for future shared multi-use path”. Does the Department require the Design-Builder to construct concrete driveways (either standard or lowered) to accommodate the future sidewalk and shared-use path?	Driveway profiles should<u>shall</u> be designed and constructed to accommodate the future sidewalk and shared use path.
7-3	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 (Revision #4)	What is the proposed width of the relocated AT&T easement?	This is will be determined after Definitive Design Plans are issued for Utility Coordination.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-4	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Will the Department consider scheduling one-on-one meetings with the Design-Builders to discuss the requirements of the proposed access road?	The Department will review and respond to the access road design for each Design-Builder with the Initial ROW Exhibit comments. See RFP Addendum 4 for details.
7-5	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall construct an access road to allow for access to Tracts 17 and 32”. Will the Department allow the Design-Builder to purchase either or both of these tracts in lieu of constructing an access road serving both?	No, the access road is to be constructed to avoid purchase of access rights or total acquisition of the two tracts.
7-6	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1”. Is it the Department’s intent for the Design-Builder to construct the access road using a design average daily traffic (ADT) of 0–100 vehicles per day or 101–400 vehicles per day?	The access road shall be designed using average daily traffic (ADT) of 0-100.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1”. This standard drawing allows for the use of 2:1 side slopes. Is it the Department’s intent to allow 2:1 side slopes on the proposed access road?	Yes, the low volume local road standard allows for 2:1 slopes.
7-8	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1” and that “the access road shall end with a cul-de-sac with a ninety-six foot minimum outside diameter”. This diameter is generally intended to accommodate WB-50 vehicles; however, this design vehicle is not supported by the lane widths and other design standards provided in the TDOT Standard Drawing. Is it the Department’s intent to accommodate a WB-50 design vehicle on the proposed access road?	the intent for the wide cul-de-sac is to accommodate delivery trucks and emergency vehicles turning around. The 96-foot cul-de-sac is selected to meet City of Spring Hill standards for dead end streets. See RFP Book 3 for the design criteria for the access road.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-9	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “a private driveway to Tract 17 and a field entrance to Tract 32 shall be provided”. Will the Department allow the Design-Builder to construct a field entrance to Tract 17 if the proposed design for the Project results in acquisition of the residence on Tract 17?	No, one purpose for the access road is to serve the residence on Tract 17. The driveway should be replaced in-kind. <u>No, a driveway to Tract 17 shall be constructed.</u>
7-10	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder's access road design shall be submitted with the Initial Right-of-Way Exhibit Submittal and in the Technical Proposal [...] this submittal shall include the horizontal alignment, vertical alignment, and proposed ROW acquisition areas”. Is it the Department’s intent for the proposed ROW for the access road to cover proposed side slopes? If not, what is the proposed ROW width of the access road?	It’s the Department’s intent for the ROW to cover the slopes, including any special ditches, and enough working room beyond the slopes (typically 10’) to construct slope ties to existing ground.
7-11	Bridge Preliminaries	The bridge over Aenon Creek shows the measurement of the shoulder point to the top of the rail, while the bridge over I-65 shows the measurement of the shoulder point to the bottom of the rail. It is our understanding that TDOT’s current guidance is to measure to the bottom of the rail. Can you provide an answer on the preferred measurement?	According to TDOT STD. DWG STD1-1SS the roadway width is measured to the top of the rail.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-12	RFP Book 3, Section 5.2	<p>The following statement is included in the RFP, “The distance between light poles and bridge must be a minimum of 50ft.”. Our initial interpretation of this statement was to provide a lateral offset from the Buckner Rd. bridge over I-65 and the proposed light poles running parallel with I-65 in an effort to prevent the design builder from installing lights too close to the bridge. We assumed that the offset width would allow sufficient clearance during future maintenance operations. We also assumed it would help provide sufficient light spread under the proposed structure. Please verify the intent of the 50’ offset.</p>	<p>The Department references the guidance of Section 15.3.5 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual. The 50ft minimum clearance distance is required for this project, as stated in RFP Book 3, to allow light spread under the bridge and to provide room for future maintenance.</p>
7-13	RFP Book 3, Section 5.2	<p>“No high-mast lighting poles shall be placed outside the interchange quadrants.” Our initial interpretation of this statement was that high-mast light poles could not be outside the limits of the new interchange. We consider the interchange to be segment No. 2 (PIN 128576.00) with a station range along Buckner Rd of 138+00.00 to 163+70.00. Please specify what was meant by interchange quadrants?</p>	<p>The four interchange quadrants are defined as the grass areas between the paved shoulders of Ramps A, B, C, and D and Interstate 65, limited by the Buckner Road Bridge over I-65.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-14	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, “Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road” (Revision #3)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the third revision of the RFP states that “a median opening shall be provided at STA. 134+30 within Segment No. 1. Within Segment No. 3, median openings shall be provided at a uniform spacing within a range of 880 feet and 1,760 feet”. What is the design vehicle for these median openings?	The median openings for Tract 15 and the access road shall be designed for a WB-40. All other median openings are to accommodate U-turns of passenger vehicles.
7-15	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 4.1; Median Island Details	Contract Book 3, Section 4.1 of the RFP states that “the new structure over Interstate 65 shall be wide enough to incorporate the [...] 12’ future shared-use path”. However, the median island details provide a width of 11’-2” ± at the locations of the overhead sign structures and flared single-slope concrete median barrier walls. Is it the Department’s intent to allow widths for the future shared-use path of less than 12’ along Bridge No. 1 at the locations of flared single-slope concrete median barrier walls to accommodate overhead sign structures, light standards, and other items?	The Design-Builder may encroach a maximum of one foot into the shared-use path with the overhead sign support foundation.
7-16	Median Island Details	Will the Department allow surfaces other than concrete, such as grass, in the 6” raised medians?	The raised median along Buckner Road between DDI crossover intersections (the hatched area in the median island details) shall be 6” raised concrete as noted in the detail along with 6” sloping detached concrete curbs (see Std. Dwg RP-SC-1). All other limits of the raised median shall be raised grass (sodded) median with 6” sloping curbs as shown in the functional plans (see typical sections).

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 11/17/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-1	RFP Book 1 Section D.5 and RFP Book 3 Section 5.2	Can the Department clarify if and when a written response to the comments received from review of the Initial Lighting Design Exhibit Review are to be submitted? Section 5.2 of the RFP Book 3 states that they are to be included in the Technical Proposal with Response Category IV, but the response letter states that concurrence will be provided during final design.	No written response is required, however comments shall be addressed and incorporated into the technical proposal. The technical proposal shall include Response Category IV Item 4.b.2, along with the ROW Acquisition Sheets, with any comments received from the initial design exhibit review addressed.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-2	RFP Contract Book 1, Addendum 4	RFP Contract Book 1, Addendum 4 Item number 203-50.50 Construction of Access Road states, "all costs associated with providing access to Tracts 17 and 32 per Contract Book 3 Section 3.11. If it is determined during ROW acquisition that this item is not needed, the Department will reduce the lump sum contract amount by the amount bid for Item No. 203-50.50." Regarding costs associated with the ROW Scope, please confirm that the access road ROW acquisition process will be consistent with all other ROW Scope on the Project, per RFP Book 3, Section 7.0, and that Design-Builder is not responsible for actual purchase of the land?	Item No. 203-50.50 is for costs to construct the access road. All design and acquisition process costs are in the other related items and paid for in accordance with RFP Book 3 Chapter 7.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-3	RFP Contract Book 1, Addendum 4	RFP Contract Book 3, Addendum 4, Section 3.11 states, "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for preparing any additional environmental technical studies and completion of the NEPA document reevaluation(s) if its design falls outside the construction limits shown in the NEPA document." Please clarify if a reevaluation is needed if design extends beyond the Construction Limits or the Environmental Technical Study Area?	As stated, "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for preparing any additional environmental technical studies and completion of the NEPA document reevaluation(s) if its design falls outside the construction limits shown in the approved NEPA document." <u>See Addendum #6</u>
8-4	RFP Contract Book 1, Section 2	Will the deliverable documents require review by agencies other than TDOT and FHWA, such as the City of Spring Hill, TN, or Middle-Tennessee Electric (Lighting Design)? If so, can the Design-Builder assume a 10-day review period, concurrent with TDOT review?	Review periods will be as defined in Section 2.2 of RFP Book 3. Review periods not defined by Section 2.2 of Book 3 shall be determined by the Design-Builder.
8-5	QR-5	According to the response to QR 5-31, Structures on a tract identified as "Loss of Access" shall be demolished and removed. Will the Design-Builder have to accommodate the 120 Day Utility Coordination Phase for Utilities servicing these structures? Can the Design-Builder assume existing utility service to these tracts can be discontinued and will not be required to be relocated?	Addendum 4 requires construction of access road, which eliminates need for Loss of Access to those tracts. Disconnecting private utility services is not subject to statutory utility coordination periods. Existing utility service to be discontinued if the structure is a relocation from proposed right-of-way impact. Utility service for partial acquisition to be

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
			determined by the ROW acquisition process.
8-6	Preliminary Lighting Submittal	Please confirm that the maximum allowable distance between pull boxes is 250 feet.	250' is the maximum allowable spacing between pull boxes.
8-7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 5.2	The RFP states to construct Complete Interchange Lighting (CIL) in accordance with TDOT Traffic Design Manual. TDOT Traffic Design Manual Figure 15.8 Calculation Points for Luminance and Illuminance Design Methods shows photometric data points relative to "lane widths". Please clarify if the term "lane widths" applies only to travel lanes or is inclusive of shoulder pavement in photometric analysis.	"Lane widths" is inclusive of the shoulder pavement in photometric analysis.
8-8	QR - 3	Per response to QR #3-11, a lighting maintenance agreement for the interchange lighting will be secured by TDOT and City of Spring Hill. Please clarify if TDOT will maintain the interchange lighting and MTEMC will maintain the additional lighting along Buckner Rd that is to be included in the forthcoming Addendum?	The city will be responsible for maintaining the lighting. This is covered in the local agency agreement and the ROW Proposal for the Interchange.
8-9	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 5.2	Per discussions with Middle Tennessee Electric, they have recommended two separate electrical	Yes, it is an acceptable concept. The Design-Builder shall coordinate

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
		<p>services for the interchange crossover signals. Please confirm that this is acceptable by TDOT and/or City of Spring Hill for future Maintenance purposes?</p>	<p>between all the stakeholders including the electrical provider (MTEMC), the City of Spring Hill, and TDOT on electrical service points (see RFP Book 3).</p>
8-10	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9 Environmental	<p>Regarding USACE 404 Permitting, there is a significant difference in the duration required to secure a 404 Nationwide Permit versus a 404 Individual Permit. Should the Design-Builder assume the Project will covered under a 404 Nationwide Permit, or 404 Individual Permit?</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 9.7, states “The Design-Builder shall determine all permits required in order to perform the work”.</p>
8-11	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9 Environmental	<p>Regarding TDEC ARAP Permitting, there is a significant difference in the duration required, and mitigation required, for a General ARAP Permit versus an Individual ARAP Permit. Should the Design-Builder assume the Project will be covered under a General ARAP Permit of Individual ARAP Permit?</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 9.7, states “The Design-Builder shall determine all permits required in order to perform the work”.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-12	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9 Environmental	<p>It appears that purchase of Credits through Mitigation Banks within HUC 06040003 are not currently available and may not be available at the time Mitigation Planning is required for Permitting purposes.</p> <p>Does TDOT have Credits available that can be purchased by the Design-Builder?</p> <p>If Credits are not available, is it TDOT's intent that the Design-Builder will be required to select a Permittee-Responsible Mitigation Option, either off-site or on-site?</p>	<p>TDOT does not have credits that the Design-Builder can purchase.</p> <p>Per RFP Book 3 Section 9.6, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for all compensatory mitigation.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-13	RFP Book 3, Section 1.3 (Page 4)	<p>Page 4 of RFP Book 3 (Section 1.3) states “The Design-Builder shall bear the risk for any changes in its design or construction resulting from its failure to verify the survey and geotechnical data provided by the Department.”</p> <p>Considering access to Tract 15 (West of I-65) was denied for any geotechnical verification or exploration, it is unclear how the statement above will be handled.</p> <p>When the Project commences, if there are changes in geology, unknown sinkholes, extensive phosphatic and unsuitable material uncovered, will this be considered a Differing Site Condition?</p>	<p>The geotechnical investigations are the responsibility of the Design-Builder in accordance with Section 6.0 of RFP Book 3.</p>
8-14	RFP Book 3, Section 9 Environmental	<p>It is our understanding that a Categorical Exclusion was done for this Project.</p> <p>If extensive permitting with USACE or TDEC is needed, will a more detailed Environmental Assessment of NEPA Process be required?</p> <p>This could result in impacts associated with public comments or re-evaluations that could be a major change that the Design-Build teams cannot account for at this time.</p>	<p>If the USACE must issues an Individual 404 permit, the USACE will then develop their own NEPA document, but the Design-Builder shall provide information to the USACE during the development of the document, as needed.</p> <p>For Mitigation, the design builder shall be responsible for the NEPA Technical Studies and required NEPA Re-evaluations including a more</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
			<p>detailed environmental assessment, if required. See RFP Book 3 Section 9.6.</p> <p>If the Design-Builder's <u>design or construction activities are different than those steps outside of the construction limits</u> evaluated by the <u>approved NEPA document study</u>, it shall be the Design-Builder's responsibility for any additional Technical Studies and <u>or required NEPA Re-evaluations that may be required</u>. See RFP Book 3 Sections <u>7.0, 9.0,</u> and 9.7.</p>
8-15	Reference Material – Geotechnical Report	<p>Per the Department's Geotechnical Report, Phosphatic Material is present within the Project.</p> <p>Please confirm if it will be up to the Design-Builder to determine the suitability of these soils, per Geotechnical Design and TDOT Specifications for Embankment, or if all materials shall be wasted off-site, as indicated by TDOT's response to QR 3-31, and the price to accommodate this be included in the Bid.</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to provide material meeting contract requirements and TDOT specifications. See RFP Book 3 Chapter 10. As stated in QR-3-31, any material obtained from the site that does not meet requirements, should be wasted off-site in accordance with the contract requirements for waste sites, including permitting.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-16	QR 6-7	<p>TDOT response to QR 6-7 states that “Right of Entry will not be allowed prior to Initiation of Negotiations.”</p> <p>We assume that this does not pertain to Design related field investigation and activities, such as Survey and Geotechnical work. Please confirm.</p>	<p>Access to private property for survey and geotechnical activities shall be in accordance with the TDOT Survey Manual and Section 6.1 of RFP Book 3, respectively.</p>
8-17	Addendum 4	<p>TDOT has specified that the Design-Builder is to account in their schedule for the Definitive Design package related to the AT&T Legacy Line be approved by May 1st, 2021 and to account for an (18) month duration from May 1st for the Utility Coordination and Relocation by AT&T Legacy.</p> <p>This duration appears to greatly increase the risk of late performance or delay to delivery of the Project and could put the Federal Grant at Risk. Has TDOT evaluated this risk into their overall schedule requirements and considered it into their Liquidated Damages amount, or B-Day amount, evaluation?</p>	<p>The Liquidated Damage and B-value amounts for this contract have been established and included in the RFP (see Addendum 3).</p>
8-18	QR 5-31	Per TDOT Response to QR 5-31, the structure(s)	See response to QR8-5.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
		<p>on Tract 17 referred to as “Loss of Access” shall be demolished and removed.</p> <p>Since response to that QR, the Department has added a requirement for an Access Road to Tract 17 and Tract 18.</p> <p>Please confirm if the structure at Tract 17 is still intended to be removed? If so, will this property owner be accommodated with a “commercial relocation” given it is operated as an Airbnb?</p>	<p>If the Design-Builders design is configured so this residence is outside of ROW, then it can remain pending the outcome of the ROW negotiations. If the Design-Builders design requires removal of the residence for proposed ROW, the determination for the type of relocation will be made during ROW acquisition.</p>
8-19	Addendum 4	<p>The Department states that it is the Design-Builder’s responsibility for any NEPA re-evaluation required for the Access Rd. to Tracts 17/18.</p> <p>Will the Department provide a duration that the Design-Builder shall assume for the NEPA re-evaluation process associated with this Access Rd?</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to perform NEPA re-evaluation(s) and establish the associated impact to their schedule.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-20	QR 5-26	<p>The Department's response to this question indicates that the existing pavement at Lewisburg Pike shall be milled and overlaid with 1.25" of PG7-22 GR D.</p> <p>However, the proposed versus existing profiles shown in the Functional Plans do not support that, but rather show extensive level-up required to match the proposed profile.</p> <p>Shall the Design-Builder account for any asphalt level up required to construct the Lewisburg Pike main lanes to the proposed profile shown in the Functional Plans and/or any required cross-slope and grade correction to match the proposed widening profile?</p>	<p>The Functional Plans are for information only. The Design-Builder shall design and construct the improvements to meet the contract requirements and design criteria included in the RFP.</p>
8-21	RFP Book 3, Section 7 ROW	<p>Due to recent subdivision of properties and other business interests of properties, there appears to be several parcels at risk for Eminent Domain. Will the Department be proactive in engaging the condemnation process to minimize the impact to the overall Project schedule?</p>	<p>Per RFP Book 3, the Design-Builder shall anticipate time for condemnation proceedings. The Design-Builder is solely at risk for any delays for right-of-entry associated with condemnation proceedings.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-22	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 8 Utilities	<p>This is to seek further clarification regarding the handling of utilities on the Project. We understand that the Department will be responsible for the Utility Coordination. A key component of that coordination effort is to ensure the utility owners perform their work in a timely manner.</p> <p>Under the applicable statutes, TDOT has the authority to require utility owners to perform their work on a schedule that is consistent with the completion of the Project. Will TDOT commit to exercise their rights when it becomes necessary to avoid delays to the work due to utility relocations?</p>	<p>If a utility does not complete their relocation within the approved schedule of calendar days, per the utility owner agreement, the Department will levy fines on the utility per our utility relocation process.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-23	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 8 Utilities	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 8 states...”No additional compensation or time shall be granted for any delays, inconveniences, or damage sustained by the Design-Builder or its Subcontractors due to interferences from utilities or the operation of relocating utilities.”</p> <p>Standard Specification 108.07B, Excusable, Non-Compensable Delays, includes Utilities as an example of such delay that would provide a Time Extension.</p> <p>Please confirm whether delays, inconveniences or damages sustained by Design-Builder or its Subcontractors due to interference from utilities or operation of relocating utilities will be evaluated as a Non-Compensable Delay as outlined in Standard Specification 108.07B, which would be consistent with other TDOT Design-Build Procurements.</p>	<p>The Department will evaluate utility delays considered outside the Design-Builder’s control and make a determination on a case by case basis as they arise in accordance with the Standard Specification 108.07B and/or contract terms as applicable.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-24	RFP Book 2, Section 3 Indemnification	<p>RFP Contract Book 2, Section 3 Indemnification states “The Design-Builder shall indemnify and hold harmless the State, the Department, and all of its officers, agents, and employees from all suits, actions or claims of any character arising from the Design-Builder’s acts or omissions in the prosecution of the work...”</p> <p>We request that the word “negligent” be added before the words “acts or omissions” in this section.</p>	<p>RFP Contract Book 2, Section 3 Indemnification will be changed to “The Design-Builder shall indemnify and hold harmless the State, the Department, and all of its officers, agents, and employees from all suits, actions or claims of any character arising from the Design-Builder’s <u>negligent or other tortious acts or omissions</u> in the prosecution of the work...” in an upcoming Addendum.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-25	RFP Book 3, Section 7 ROW	<p>The Design-Builder will include in its proposed schedule the time necessary to acquire rights of way for the Project in accordance with state and federal law.</p> <p>There are actions within the process of acquiring rights of way which cannot be taken by Design-Builder but can only be performed by TDOT.</p> <p>If Design-Builder demonstrates that the approved schedule includes the periods of time dictated by State and Federal rights of way acquisition requirements, but Design-Builder is delayed by TDOT during the phases TDOT controls, will Design-Builder be entitled to a change order under Section 2.11 of the Design Build Standard Guidance, which provides that the Contract Time/Amount may be adjusted due to the “Acts or omissions by TDOT or its duly appointed representative that unreasonable interfere with the Design-Builder’s performance and cause delay of work on the critical path of the CPM Schedule.”</p>	<p>For the ROW Acquisition process, TDOT only controls response to Design-Builder submittals and will provide review responses in accordance with Section 2.2 of RFP Book 3. All other activities within that process are the responsibility of the Design-Builder to and shall be defined within their schedule.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-26	RFP Book 3, Appendix A; Pavement Evaluation Report, Williamson Co. I-65	Per our understanding of the “Pavement Evaluation Report”, cores taken on September 8 th and included in the report were all from the outside shoulder of I-65. Is there any information about the inside shoulders of I-65? If temporary pavement, beyond that which is required to remove (mill and overlay) the existing rumble strips on the shoulders, is required for maintenance of traffic operations, what pavement section should be used? Is it the intent of the department for these areas to be paved using the full depth section provided in the RFP and to remain after the completion of temporary traffic operations?	There is no information available from the Department for existing pavement of the inside shoulder of I-65. All available information has been provided on the project website in reference materials. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design any temporary pavement. The response to QR3-36 will be revised in the final QR document.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-27	RFP Book 3, Section 11.0	<p>Developing the NB I-65 proposed work zone in accordance with standard drawing T-WZ-16, and applying the required buffer zone and the required lane shift distance, the northbound I-65 temporary lane shift will begin immediately after the point where I-65 already drops the outside lane from Saturn Parkway to reduce from 3 lanes to 2 lanes. Typically to meet the MUTCD when merging a lane and performing a lane shift there is a buffer zone (1/2L) required between these actions. Will TDOT require a buffer distance between the existing lane drop and the proposed temporary lane shift? If this buffer distance is required, what is the acceptable distance? Is it acceptable to adjust the location of the lane drop temporarily to the south to achieve this buffer?"</p>	<p>A buffer shall be provided. The buffer between the lane shift and the end of the acceleration lane taper shall be 730 feet. The Design-Builder may temporarily stripe the Saturn Parkway on-ramp to I-65 NB to allow the buffer. The single lane section of the acceleration lane shall be shortened as little as possible, but shall not be less than 2,000 feet excluding the tapers. Upon removing the lane shift, the Design-Builder shall restore the striping of the acceleration lane to its pre-construction configuration.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-28	RFP Book 3, Section 3.2	Reference to QR#6-1 if the limits of mill and overlay along I-65 extend beyond the ETSA boundary because of disturbance to the pavement or pavement markings caused by traffic control activities, will a re-evaluation of the NEPA document be required? If a minor re-evaluation is required, would the Department complete this work?	Re-evaluation of the NEPA document is required if the limits of construction are extended beyond those included in the approved NEPA document and will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
8-29	Response Category IV: Technical Solution	In questions 7 and 8, did the Department intend to ask the following twice, “Describe any geotechnical investigations to be performed by the Design-Builder”? Should the language be struck from question no. 7?	Yes. Ignore the duplicate statement in responding to Question 7.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-30	RFP Book 3, Section 3.5	Regarding the statement, “Inlets shall not drain onto or through existing or future roads or drainage systems excluding the culverts along I-65.”, will a linear detention system meeting the requirements described in section 8.03.2 of the department’s drainage manual be acceptable to release stormwater at a rate equal to or less than the pre-developed runoff rate at the western termini of the project near Buckner Lane?	The intent of this section of the RFP is that stormwater for the DB project shall not be directed to an existing or known future planned road. The Design-Builder shall analyze the impacts to any receiving system of runoff from the project to demonstrate no adverse effect to existing or currently planned infrastructure.
8-31	Response to Initial ROW and Access Road Submittal; Reference to Upcoming Addendum	Per the letter we received, the following is stated, “The CA fence shall be offset from the toe of slope along the ramps a distance of 20’ similar to that required by Note 4 on Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-5 for freeways.” Is this intended just for the area adjacent to the proposed access road or is it applied to all new ramp areas (acceleration/deceleration, taper areas, etc.) even if short sections of slopes encroach on the existing fence?	This is intended for the full length of all proposed ramps.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-32	Book 3; Section 9	If a NEPA re-evaluation is required, will the Department approve Definitive Design plans for the May 1, 2021 deadline without a fully approved NEPA document?	A re-evaluation is the responsibility of the Design-Builder including the associated schedule impacts and do not relieve the DB from other contract requirements, such as the contract term or specific milestones. NEPA, including any re-evaluations, must be approved prior to acceptance of Definitive Design plans.
8-33	Book 3; Section 3.11	Addendum #4 indicated that the Access Road may not ultimately be constructed. What is the Department's criteria for that decision and when will that decision be made (prior to Definitive Design Plan approval)?	<u>Construction of the access road is required and all costs to be included in 203-50.50. The access road shall be in the Design-Builder's Final Definitive Design as required by the RFP with final determination during ROW acquisition.</u>Need for the access road will be determined during the ROW acquisition process associated with the Design-Builder's Definitive Design as accepted by the Department.
8-34	Book 3; Section 7	If condemnation is required for a parcel on this project, will the Department sign off on the ROW phase and allow construction activities to occur based on Right-of-Entry or order of possession?	Right-of-Entry prior to certification of ROW acquired for a parcel will not be allowed.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

8-35	Book 3; Section 3.11	Can LIC 2 be broken into multiple submittal packages for the purpose of meeting the DD deadline of May 1 st ?	Yes. The Definitive Design and Readiness-for-Construction Plans can be combined and/or submitted in reasonable phases or segments to expedite progress. A separate NTP will be issued for each RFC phase or segment. (Section 5.2.2 of the Design Build Standard Guidance).
------	----------------------	--	--

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-36	Book 1; Procurement Schedules/Submittal Deadlines	With the recent addenda, would the Department entertain the submittal of ATC's with the proposal	ATC's are no longer accepted.
8-37	Book 1; Item 203-50.50	Since the cost of the frontage road could determine the low bid of part A, would the Department consider using an allowance for all bidders?	The Design-Builder should include a cost for constructing the access road as required by the RFP.
8-38	Book 3; Section 3.11	Is the Design Builder at risk if ATT's schedule to relocate exceeds 18 months?	The Department will evaluate utility delays considered outside the Design-Builder's control and make a determination on a case by case basis as they arise in accordance with the Standard Specification 108.07B and/or contract terms as applicable.
8-39	Book 3; Section 3.11	Are there any limitations on where the design builder can stage and/or work in wither the Interchange area or LIC No. 2 during the relocation of the ATT line?	The Design-Builder can stage work at their cost as desired if all contract requirements are met.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-40	Per DB2001_QR5_9-24 question #5-29.	Please verify that the Uniformity calculation Max:Min of 6:1 will be an additional requirement for this job since it is usually only required for the Luminance method for lighting design calculations.	The uniformity ratio (the “average/minimum”, which is 3:1) and the Minimum Maintained Average Values “0.9” are the two values that must be calculated.
8-41	Based on the response for QR#5-30:	Do these requirements outlined in the response apply to only jurisdictional streams or do they apply to all hydraulic conveyances?	It applies to jurisdictional streams only.
8-42	Book 1 – Section E.1.a; Pg 24; Per the last paragraph on page 24	“Price Proposals shall be submitted using Internet bidding...”. When will the .ebsx file be posted to Bid Express so that we may setup and format our price proposal for submission?	The Bid Express file will be posted November 20th.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-43	Book 3 – Appendix A: Engineering Analysis Pavement Design	Temporary traffic control will require shifting the travel lanes of I-65 to the inside and utilizing the inside shoulders. Standard Drawing T-WZ-16 describes using (BPMB-HM) Grading D for up to 3” then (BPMB-HM) Grading A for anything beyond 3” in conjunction with the D mix. Is the intent to use this pavement design or will the Department supply an updated design to include temporary pavement on I-65?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design any temporary pavement.
8-44	Book 3 – Appendix A: Engineering Analysis Pavement Design	Temporary traffic control on Lewisburg Pike may require temporary pavement. Will the Department provide a temporary pavement design or is it the responsibility of the Design Builder?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design any temporary pavement.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-45	Functional Plans (updated 10-12-20) sheets 4, 4A&B & 5, 5A&B	<p>The construction of Buckner Road is creating a dam affect with a headwater elevation plus freeboard that will overtop the functional plan profile for approximately 1,300 feet at the beginning of the project. This requires raising the profile and/or adding additional cross drains not shown to meet TDOT Drainage requirements. Due to the proximity of Buckner Lane/Buckner Road intersection (designed by others) there is potential impact to its design. Is it acceptable to raise the profile in this area? If so, please provide guidance on acceptable grades.</p>	<p>The Buckner Lane intersection project will construct Buckner Road to STA 102+50 using the profile shown in the Functional Plans. The Design-Builder may revise the profile east of STA 102+50 but shall tie to the intersection project at STA 102+50 at the elevation provided. The revised profile shall meet the requirements of the Design Guidelines, Drainage Manual, and Section 3 of the RFP. The addition of cross drains is an acceptable means to meet the drainage requirements of the project.</p>